

FY2016 IT Plan – Department of Human Services Responses

- Page 14 - Please explain the nature of the "material" expenditures for the \$6.6 million ORS maintenance and the \$5.1 DCFS maintenance costs?
 - **ORS Response:** Approximately \$5 million of the \$6.6 million for ORS maintenance was for DTS charges. The remainder is for contractors and regular maintenance.
 - **DCFS Response:** This item is a combination of DCFS computer purchases and charges for DTS staff and contractors.

- Page 15 - Please provide the estimated General Fund amount used to finance this project. Who is providing the General Fund? ORS or the AG? At a \$1 million cost for 100 users that is \$10,000 per user. Please describe the benefit to the citizens by this IT change.
 - **ORS Response:** We have conferred with DTS and we are not sure where the \$1,000,000 figure originated—possibly a typing error? This project was started in FY 15 and completed early in FY 16. The actual costs for this entire project were \$30,900. Based on the ORS Cost Allocation Plan, this amount breaks down to \$11,050 from General Fund (provided by ORS) and \$19,850 in Federal matching funds.
While the citizens may not see an obvious benefit to this enhancement, the ability to easily equalize caseloads among available workers helps to guarantee that all cases have equal opportunity to receive attention and be monitored for the next appropriate steps within the judicial system.

- Page 29 - What is the estimated state General Fund that will be used to finance this project? Who is providing the General Fund? ORS or the Department of Health? Is this a requirement being imposed upon ORS via the Department of Health?
 - **ORS Response:** This project was started in FY 2015 and completed early in FY 2016. The actual total cost was \$34,012. The approximate General Fund portion based on the approved ORS Cost Allocation Plan was \$12,163.
This is a requirement being imposed by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services which affected both The Department of Health, and by extension, the Office of Recovery Services by virtue of the ORS contract with the Department of Health to provide third-party liability Medicaid recovery services. A portion of the annual contract “payment” from DOH to ORS for services contributes to the technical upgrades required, but this General Fund portion “paid” by DOH to ORS does appear in the ORS budget.

- Page 33 – (1) What is the estimated state General Fund that will be used to finance this project? Who is providing the General Fund? DCFS or the Court? (2) Is this a requirement being imposed upon DCFS via the Court? (3) It appears that this, along with other DCFS changes, will be made in the Legacy SAFE system. Am I reading the narrative correctly that these changes will be done in such a way as to be flexible enough to use in the new SAFE system (as that is implemented)?

- **DCFS Response:** (1) The SAFE portion project has already been deployed to production and the bulk of the work was done during FY15. FY16 DTS costs were \$718. There is some funding through the court from the Court Improvement Grant that SAFE utilizes via an Interagency Transfer. That transfer will take place in January 2016 to cover this cost in entirety. When there are costs associated with SAFE/CARE development and operations that exceed available grant money, then those costs are subject to the same federal / state cost allocations as other SAFE funding. (2) Yes. E-File is affecting all entities who submit documents to the Court. (3) This change was made to the web interface, not desktop interface. The general approach is to implement change requests in the SAFE web interface whenever possible.
- Page 38 - I'm confused. If this is a system change to help benefit "eligibility caseworkers in their day-to-day duties," why are there only 30 users? Or are there only 30 "eligibility caseworkers" for DCFS? Are these eligibility workers DCFS or DWS employees? Who is providing the state match for this upgrade - DCFS or DWS?
 - **DCFS Response:** This number represents those specialized DCFS caseworkers who deal with Adoption Subsidy Eligibility. Not all DCFS caseworkers are involved in these activities. No DWS employees are involved.

These eligibility changes are a requirement from the Children's Bureau, our federal partner, who has provided funding since the inception of SAFE and are mandated if we wish to continue to receive funding. These costs are subject to the same federal / state cost allocations as other SAFE funding.

- Page 47 - What is the estimated General Fund being used to finance this project?
 - **USH Response:** 82% or \$29,520
- Page 49 - What is the estimated General Fund being used to finance this project?
 - **USH Response:** 82% or \$49,200
- Page 53 - What is the estimated General Fund portion used to finance this project? This project starts out describing itself as "maintenance' but then talks about migrating "as quickly as possible to a compliant .NET/web environment." Is this project really to do that? To migrate to a web environment?
 - **USH Response:** 82% or \$287,000 is General Fund. Yes, the project will become web based.
- Page 59 - Please remind me again what the tangible financial benefits are that the citizenry receives from the USH being "Joint Commission-accredited."
 - **USH Response:** Being accredited by TJC grants "deemed status" with CMS. This makes us eligible to receive our Medicaid funding of \$13 million net of match.